



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/381,839	09/24/1999	GUNTER DOEMENS	P99.1690	4490

30596 7590 07/03/2002

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O.BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

LAROSE, COLIN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2002

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/381,839

Applicant(s)

DOEMENS ET AL.

Examiner

Colin M. LaRose

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 24 September 1999 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2623

DETAILED ACTION

Amendments

1. Applicants' amendments filed 24 September 1999, have been entered and made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,511,252 by Di Matteo et al. ("Di Matteo") and disclosed prior art of U.S. Patent 5,905,545 by Poradish et al. ("Poradish").

Regarding claim 1, Di Matteo discloses a method for three-dimensional identification of an object having an object surface, said method comprising the steps of:

successively projecting a number of encoded illumination patterns (column 1, lines 61-66, and figure 5) in a beam path through a variable filter (column 5, lines 28-31) onto said object by alternating color bands (column 6, lines 58-61) to sequentially illuminate said object surface with at least three colors (figure 5) for identification of at least three depth planes of said object in a single image;

registering said image of said object with a color camera from a direction different from said beam path (figure 1a); and

Art Unit: 2623

calculating a high precision topography of said object surface from said registration in a control and evaluation unit (column 1, lines 28-32, and computer 48, figure 4 that reconstructs the object's surface [column 6, lines 23-28]).

Di Matteo is silent to illuminating a digital micro mirror arrangement via a light source and driving the digital micro mirror arrangement.

Poradish discloses that a digital micromirror device (DMD) modulator can replace a traditional tristimulus projection display, wherein each of the primary colors is simultaneously modulated by a color wheel (column 1, lines 52-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Di Matteo by Poradish to illuminate a digital micro mirror arrangement via a light source and drive the digital micro mirror arrangement, since replacing a full-color projection display with a digital micro mirror arrangement that sequentially displays red, green, and blue light can reduce the amount of system hardware (column 1, lines 63-66).

Regarding claim 2, Di Matteo discloses the encoded illumination patterns comprising a stripe pattern having successively varied periodicity (figure 5).

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Di Matteo and Poradish, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of disclosed prior art of U.S. Patent 5,838,428 by Pipitone et al. ("Pipitone").

Regarding claim 3, it is unclear whether Di Matteo discloses that the method is used for facial identification.

Art Unit: 2623

Pipitone discloses that three-dimensional imaging of faces is a conventional practice (column 1, line 19).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Di Matteo and Poradish by Pipitone to use the three-dimensional imaging method for the identification of faces since Pipitone discloses determining the three-dimensional shape of a human face can be used for security purposes (column 1, line 19).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colin M. LaRose whose telephone number is (703) 306-3489. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:00 to 5:30. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au, can be reached on (703) 308-6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

CML

Group Art Unit 2623

24 June 2002


AMELIA M. AU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600